

DEPARTMENT • OF • WATER • RESOURCES
CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN
♦ UPDATE 2005 ♦

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC WORKSHOP COMMENTS
OAKLAND, CA

<i>Date:</i> June 6, 2005 1:00-5:00 p.m.		<i>Location:</i> Oakland MetroCenter Auditorium 101 Eighth Street, Oakland, California
<i>Meeting Purpose and Goals:</i>	To hear and record public comment on the Public Review Draft of the California Water Plan Update 2005	
<i>All meeting materials, including the PowerPoint presentation, are available on the California Water Plan website at: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm</i>		

Presenters:

Gina Bartlett, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy, CA State University, Sacramento

Grant Davis, Advisory Committee member, Bay Institute of San Francisco

Fran Garland, Advisory Committee member, Contra Costa Water District

Kamyar Guivetchi, Manager, Statewide Water Planning, CA Department of Water Resources (DWR)

Karl Winkler, Chief, Central District, DWR

Introduction: Purpose and Format

Gina Bartlett, meeting facilitator, introduced the presenters and DWR staff and welcomed everyone to the first CA Water Plan Update 2005 Public Input Workshop. She thanked the Association of Bay Area Governments for providing the meeting facility. The purpose of the meeting was for the CA Department of Water Resources (DWR) to receive public input and to share ideas for the Public Review Draft of the CA Water Plan.

The workshop format was interactive. Participants sat in table groups. The meeting consisted of 3 presentations by Kamyar Guivetchi (DWR), each followed by group discussion at each table. Advisory Committee members Grant Davis and Fran Garland spoke on behalf of the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Advisory Committee, and DWR Central District Chief Karl Winkler gave a presentation on the San Francisco Bay and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Regional Reports, which are located in Volume 3 of the CA Water Plan. Each table station had a DWR staff person who helped record the group discussion on a flipchart. Each table group chose a reporter among themselves who would summarize the group discussion to the entire audience on behalf of the group. Near the end of the meeting, time was reserved for individuals to orally present prepared statements. For detailed description of the format, see the “Working in Groups” handout.

Part 1 – Agenda Items A and B

A) Background & Overview / B) Comments from the Advisory Committee

This *Water Plan Update* is different than previous updates. It was prepared using a new process. There are many new features in the Water Plan. It will be continually updated as new information becomes available, and it presents a strategic plan and framework for action developed with substantial

stakeholder input. Kamyar Guivetchi spoke on the process and content of the Water Plan. Advisory Committee members Fran Garland and Grant Davis explained the *Advisory Committee View*, a 4-page handout prepared by the Advisory Committee that summarizes the areas of agreement and points of disagreement among the 65-member Advisory Committee over the last four and a half years, as well as uncertainties remaining in the Water Plan.

Below is a summary of the comments made by individuals at the tables in response to these questions:

Thinking about the presentation on Background and Overview by DWR and Comments from the Advisory Committee, what are the things you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p>No Table 1</p> <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Holistic approach. + Inclusion of non-structural elements. + Professional facilitation of Advisory Committee Meetings. <p>Table 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Strategic Plan. + Use of Alternative Scenarios + Use/involvement of Advisory Committee. + Open Process & Use of Website. + Real Data for 3 Year Types. + 3 Scenarios for Future . + Bar Graphs are very good. + 3 scenarios are a good beginning to expand analysis next time. + Regional workshops are good. + Saves paper with website and CD-ROM <p>Table 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Guide can be used by agencies as a tool. + Approach better than past. + Good that we are acknowledging that we don't have all the science. + Peter Gleick on the Advisory Committee means CA is buying into climate change issue. + Like Tribes and Environmental Groups involved in process. + Workshops all around the state really good. + Excellent that CD-ROM is included. 	<p>No Table 1</p> <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Recommend reservoirs on the North Coast rivers. Δ Conservation should be emphasized more. The League of Women Voters thinks conservation should be included as an Initiative. Δ Conjunctive Use should be enhanced. Δ Flood water should be captured to recharge groundwater basins. Δ We should use water more efficiently to preserve the quality of life for our grandchildren. Δ More definite funding plans should be included in the Water Plan. Δ Need better description of what "infrastructure" means in the 2nd Water Plan Initiative <p>Table 3:</p> <p>No Comments</p> <p>Table 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Tribal section does not discuss how tribes have tribal governments with their own laws that apply to water (i.e. mercury content). Δ Nobody on the Advisory Committee was an Indian lawyer. The document needs that level of review. Δ Need for higher emphasis on water use efficiency; importance of Foundational Elements in Framework for Action diagram not clear. 	<p>No Table 1</p> <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doubts about climate change occurring <p>Table 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is flood control emphasized on p. 18 of the Highlights document? • Should <i>drought</i> year water uses be calculated and presented? <p>Table 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Here to get a clearer picture of the Water Plan, had not read the document • Here to gain knowledge for support for clients. • Often Tribe and Environmental input lost along the way. How to ensure that does not happen? • More info on Hot Button Issues and Action Items. • Important to realize things getting integrated for the 1st time; i.e. Grant funds; look at how agency fits into water plan • Final plan needs real direction for policy makers, i.e., list of suggested actions. • Final Plan should describe how the regions are going to talk to each other, especially regions with reliance on imported water. Further elaboration is needed. • If the public is critical of the document, what will the response of DWR be? Will DWR still release a document the public in general doesn't agree with?

Individual Comment forms: + Holistic – considers both structural and nonstructural solutions + Liked the visuals in the presentation. + Like the summary sheet.	Individual Comment forms: Δ The “California Water Balance” figure in the <i>Highlights</i> document is <u>extremely</u> hard to read in 3-D. This should be 2-D only. The slanted lines also complicate reading levels. Δ More definite funding plan (recognition of “public benefit” of water development for environmental purposes).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do IRWMP goals relate to goals of CWP? Individual Comment forms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Haven’t read the document yet, so don’t know what I want changed yet.
---	--	--

Part 2 – Agenda Items C and D

C) California Water Today & Water Balance / D) Regional Reports

It is important for a strategic plan to have a clear description of current conditions and accomplishments. Chapter 3 of Volume 1 (Strategic Plan) is called “California Water Today.” As the largest chapter in Volume 1, it is intended to provide education and reference information. It gives general findings from both statewide and regional perspectives as well as the perspectives of different water use sectors (agriculture, urban, and environment). Volume 3 of the Water Plan has more detailed information on each of the 10 hydrologic regions (plus additional reports for Statewide, Mountain Counties, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta), covering conditions, challenges, accomplishments, and future opportunities of the Region presented, as well as quantified water balances for supply and use. Kamyar Guivetchi presented the slides on California Water Today and statewide water balances, and Central District Chief Karl Winkler summarized slides on the Volume 3 regional reports for the San Francisco Bay Region and the Delta.

Below is a summary of the comments made by individuals at the tables in response to these questions:

Thinking about the description of California Water Today and the Regional Reports, what are the things you:

Liked	Would Change	Don’t Know, Have Questions About:
Table 2: + Energy-water linkage Table 4: + Happy to see mercury represented, but needs more emphasis. + Happy to see Klamath Basin information. Need to talk about possible solutions involving seasonal releases. Individual Comment forms: + Liked the overall presentation	Table 2: Δ It is difficult to answer questions because we have just received the copy of the Water Plan Δ We need dual plumbing systems for indoor and outdoor uses. Δ It would be helpful to have the summary chart of challenges and current conditions included in the hard copy of the regional report. Table 3: Δ Need higher emphasis for	Table 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do we take the information in the plan and apply it on the ground, e.g. setting rates at private water companies? How can the linkage be developed between the Water Plan and policy at various state agencies. The Water Plan was originally a water supply plan. What does the loss of wetland habitat have to do with water supplies?

	<p>water use efficiency (in framework)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Statewide regional interaction between North & South should be increased (more coordination, communication & shared planning) Δ Clarify data; break out local supplies between imported and locally originating (both statewide and regionally) Δ For SF Region, drop Calaveras Reservoir Expansion Project. Δ New regional coordination programs could be added. <p>Table 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ It would be good to have textual discussion as to how information was developed. Δ Add links between information and references. Δ Add at least a general discussion of information sources. Δ It doesn't help to cite previous report when you still don't know where previous reports' information came from. Δ Needs a better description of sources & methods. Δ Water use supplies and quality sections don't mention subsistence fishing. Include subsistence fishing. Δ Needs a more expanded table of contents, especially because no index. Δ Make sure to always identify 1998, 2000, 2001 as "wet," "normal," and "dry" years each time. <p>Individual Comment forms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ What do Wetland and watershed "challenges" in the San Francisco Bay Region (slide in PowerPoint presentation) have to do with water supply? Loss of wetlands due to land use practices is not a product of water use or water supply development. 	<p>Table 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional planning requires state oversight to carry out. <p>Table 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What have the effects of recent legislation (SB 220, AB 610) been on development? <p>Individual Comment forms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the document adequately cover issues related to state legislation such as SB 221 and SB 610?
--	--	--

Part 3 – Agenda Items E and F**E) Preparing for the Future (Scenarios) / F) Diversifying Responses (Strategies)**

This *Water Plan Update 2005* recognizes that many things may alter water use and supplies between now and 2030. For that reason, the *Update* contains a description of three plausible yet different future scenarios. Uncertainty about future course of events creates a need for multiple options to address opportunities and challenges. Further, the Plan recognizes that one size does not fit all regions of the state. Each region will have specific requirements or needs that may not apply across the entire state. Implementing multiple options (diverse management strategies) allows water planners and managers to adapt to a variety of circumstances. Volume 2 (Resource Management Strategies) has narrative descriptions for 25 different management strategies available to help them reduce water demand, improve operational efficiency and transfers, increase water supply, improve water quality, and practice resource stewardship.

Below is a summary of the comments made by individuals at the tables in response to these questions:

Thinking from the perspective of 2030 are there things about this approach to plan for the future you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
Table 3: + Three scenarios are a good beginning to expand the analysis in future Water Plan Updates.	Individual Comment forms: Δ Acknowledge that are many variables in the Future Scenarios for 2030.	Table 4: Do the scenarios include or consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Additional toxicities in water? ○ Global warming? ○ More food for more people meaning more chemicals? ○ Analysis includes more case, less case, but what about worst case/best case? • Groundwater overdraft only receives cursory attention. • Hope document presents whole range of alternatives. • Make sure toxins have been adequately addressed in the document. • People haven't read the plan. • Keep website open for comments all the time. • Need to further emphasize impacts of global warming.

Part 4 – Additional Public Comments

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
Table 2: + Presentation reflected a lot of work. + This meeting provided the	Table 2: Δ We should try to get more people to attend these	Table 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We recognize the difficulty of getting people to attend. • The state is very diverse –

<p>opportunity for people with different backgrounds to have a discussion about water issues – liked the small discussion groups.</p>	<p>meetings.</p> <p>Individual Comment forms:</p> <p>Δ Offer a break and make an announcement about the facilities, cafeteria hours, etc.</p>	<p>climate, geography, population, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People haven't read the plan. • Keep website open for comments all the time.
---	--	---

Part 5 – Formal Public Comments (in order of presentation):

Members of the public were welcome to present statements in the formal style of a traditional public hearing. Two members of the public were registered for speaker comments:

Mike Vukelich:

Mr. Vukelich commented that many of his opinions were contrary to what he heard in his small group. He did not believe that humans could change the climate and believed that there should be reservoirs in all North Coast rivers. Rivers are wild above the reservoir, and salmon can live above the reservoir. He felt that the Water Plan should not try to encompass so many different issues and should focus more on water supply. We need water. The research is good, and he felt that this was a helpful presentation today.

Polly Smith, League of Women Voters:

Ms. Smith thanked DWR for holding meetings throughout California to educate the public about the latest Water Plan Update. She has done her best to keep League members informed. The League of Women Voters is concerned about the Framework for Action diagram in the Highlights document, since they feel that this part of the document would receive the most attention. The League was pleased with the inclusion of a “Less Resource Intensive” Scenario for 2030. However, they recommend that the Water Plan Highlights brochure add a third, equally important initiative for conservation. They felt that the omission of conservation as an initiative lowers its status and makes the Less Resource Intensive Scenario less important. They believe that a large portion of the state's future water supplies will come from the efficient use and management of existing water supplies. The League was concerned that despite the similarity between DWR's figures for future water use and growth and projections in the Planning and Conservation League's new Investment Strategy, the two reports came to different conclusions. The Pacific Institute is publishing a report in late June on the potential of conservation. Because of these simultaneous efforts, the League recommends further analysis of these reports by DWR and Advisory Committee, or a new Advisory Committee. Since all reports will be available to legislators, greater coordination can strengthen the implementation plan and minimize confusion. Further analysis is essential, and she is very glad this process is on-going. Ms. Smith thanked Kamyar Guivetchi and announced that representatives from the League would attend the other Water Plan Public Input Workshops in June.

Part 6 – Closing

Kamyar thanked the audience for participating in the public comment workshop and for their comments. He reminded everyone that the public review period will last through July 22, to allow for 60 days since the release of the printed Public Review Draft document.

The final comment deadline is July 22.

Attendance:

Public:

Larry Adams, Santa Clara Valley Water District
Ariel Ambruster, Center for Collaborative Policy
Diana Brooks, Office of Ratepayer Advocates
Heather Cooley, Pacific Institute
Grant Davis, The Bay Institute
Judie Garland, Kennedy Jenks
Peter Gleick, Pacific Institute
Marcell Hall, East Bay Municipal Utility District
Stana Hearne, League of Women Voters
Helen Hutchison, League of Women Voters
Kathy Livermore, City of Fremont
Jon Lycett, Public
Sherri Norris, International Indian Treaty Council
Cathy Pieroni, City of San Diego Water Department
Nicole Sandkulla, Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency
Polly Smith, League of Women Voters
Kathleen Van Velsor, Association of Bay Area Governments
Mike Vukelich, Farm Bureau
Vince Wong, Zone 7 Water Agency, Alameda County
Charles Yanucil, Winzler & Kelly

Staff:

Alan Aguilar, DWR
Gina Bartlett, CCP
Paul Dabbs, DWR
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR
Matt Nolberg, DWR
David Sumi, CCP
Karl Winkler, DWR
Jean Woods, DWR